



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/554,894	08/25/2000	Mats Leijon	705/72451-2	9101

25269 7590 02/25/2002

DYKEMA GOSSETT PLLC
FRANKLIN SQUARE, THIRD FLOOR WEST
1300 I STREET, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

MULLINS, BURTON S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2834

DATE MAILED: 02/25/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/554,894

Applicant(s)

LEIJON ET AL.

Examiner

Burton S. Mullins

Art Unit

2834

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 May 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121
- BURTON S. MULLINS**
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 5,8.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 14 is are objected to because of the following informalities: The grammar in claim 14, e.g. "includes at least one...", is incorrect. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-2 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over applicant's prior art and Elton et al. (US 4,853,565). Applicant describes that three phase asynchronous traction motors are the most commonly used (p.2, line 33-p.3, line 11). The details of the windings are not described.

Elton, meanwhile, teaches a high voltage cable (Fig.7) for dynamo-electric machines comprising: a conductor comprising plural strands 102, at least some of which are in electrical contact with one another; a first semi-conducting layer 104 surrounding the conductor; a solid insulating layer 106 surrounding the first semi-conducting layer; and a second semi-conducting layer 110 surrounding the insulating layer and connected to ground.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill to employ the cable of Elton on the known traction motors since Elton's cable would have been desirable to prevent corona discharge appearing in dynamo-electric machines such as asynchronous, induction motors.

A recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. In a claim drawn to a process of making, the intended use must result in a manipulative difference as compared to the prior art. See *In re Casey*, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and *In re Otto*, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963).

4. Claims 1, 3 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schauder et al. (US 4,814,964) in view of Elton et al. (US 4,853,565). Schauder teaches a three phase synchronous traction motor drive 2 with stator windings 3 and 4 fed by convertors/inverters 5 and 6. The details of the windings are not described.

Elton, meanwhile, teaches a high voltage cable (Fig.7) for dynamo-electric machines comprising: a conductor comprising plural strands 102, at least some of which are in electrical contact with one another; a first semi-conducting layer 104 surrounding the conductor; a solid insulating layer 106 surrounding the first semi-conducting layer; and a second semi-conducting layer 110 surrounding the insulating layer and connected to ground.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill to employ the cable of Elton on the traction motor of Schauder since the cable would have been desirable to prevent corona discharge appearing in dynamo-electric machines such as asynchronous, induction motors.

A recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. In a claim drawn to a process of making, the intended use must result in a manipulative difference as compared to the prior art. See *In re Casey*, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and *In re Otto*, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963).

5. Claims 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kumar et al. (US 5,712,802) in view of Elton et al. (US 4,853,565). Kumar teaches a traction vehicle, e.g. locomotive (Fig.1) including plural motors 24 and regulating devices including semiconductor ac/ac converters (inverters 22) and rectifiers 20 (Fig.2). Kumar does not teach details of the traction motor winding.

Elton, meanwhile, teaches a high voltage cable (Fig.7) for dynamo-electric machines comprising: a conductor comprising plural strands 102, at least some of which are in electrical contact with one another; a first semi-conducting layer 104 surrounding the conductor; a solid insulating layer 106 surrounding the first semi-conducting layer; and a second semi-conducting layer 110 surrounding the insulating layer and connected to ground.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill to employ the cable of Elton on the Kumar's traction motors since Elton's cable would have been desirable to prevent corona discharge appearing in dynamo-electric machines such as traction motors.

6. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wiart (US 4,072,882) in view of Elton et al. (US 4,853,565). Wiart teaches a dc-ac convertor for a

Art Unit: 2834

three-phase traction motor 14 including transformer 16 and thyristor bridge SB arranged to supply power to the motor (Fig.1). Wiart does not teach details of the transformer winding.

Elton, meanwhile, teaches a high voltage cable (Fig.7) for dynamo-electric machines comprising: a conductor comprising plural strands 102, at least some of which are in electrical contact with one another; a first semi-conducting layer 104 surrounding the conductor; a solid insulating layer 106 surrounding the first semi-conducting layer; and a second semi-conducting layer 110 surrounding the insulating layer and connected to ground. Elton suggests that the cable may also be used on transformers (c.2, lines 16-18).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill to employ the cable of Elton on the Wiart's transformer since Elton's cable would have been desirable to prevent corona discharge appearing in electrical machines such as transformers.

7. Claims 7-8, 10 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Apsitulista (US 3,571,690) in view of Elton et al. Apsitulista teaches a rotary converter for a railway coach including a single machine having both motor and generator operation (c.1, lines 51-65) and a regulator (rectifier 7). Apsitulista does not teach details of the converter cables.

Elton teaches a high voltage cable (Fig.7) for dynamo-electric machines comprising: a conductor comprising plural strands 102, at least some of which are in electrical contact with one another; a first semi-conducting layer 104 surrounding the conductor; a solid insulating layer 106 surrounding the first semi-conducting layer; and a second semi-conducting layer 110 surrounding the insulating layer and connected to ground.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill to employ the cable of Elton on Apsitulista's converter since Elton's cable would have been desirable to prevent corona discharge appearing in electrical machines.

8. Claims 9 and 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Apsitulista and Elton as applied to claims 7 and 8 above, and further in view of Wiart. Apsitulista and Elton do not teach a frequency converter and dc-ac converter, per se.

Wiart teaches a dc-ac frequency converter for a three-phase traction motor 14 including transformer 16 and thyristor bridge SB arranged to supply power to the motor (Fig.1). Wiart's converter enables torque and speed control of the traction motor (c.1, lines 7-13).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill to use the dc-ac frequency converter of Wiart on the traction drive of Apsitulista and Elton since control of torque and speed would have been desirable.

9. Claims 14-17 and 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wiart (US 4,072,882) in view of Elton et al. (US 4,853,565) and Hutchinson et al. (US 5,187,428). Wiart teaches a dc-ac convertor for a three-phase traction motor 14 including transformer 16 and thyristor bridge SB arranged to supply power to the motor (Fig.1). Wiart does not teach details of the transformer winding.

Elton teaches a high voltage cable (Fig.7) for dynamo-electric machines comprising: a conductor comprising plural strands 102, at least some of which are in electrical contact with one another; a first semi-conducting layer 104 surrounding the conductor; a solid insulating layer 106 surrounding the first semi-conducting layer; and a second semi-conducting layer 110

Art Unit: 2834

surrounding the insulating layer and connected to ground. Elton suggests that the cable may also be used on transformers (c.2, lines 16-18).

Hutchinson teaches transformers made from magnetic lamination stacks 110/112 used to direct magnetic flux, as is conventional (c.3, line 65-10).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill to employ the cable of Elton on the Wiart's transformer since Elton's cable would have been desirable to prevent corona discharge appearing in electrical machines such as transformers. Furthermore, it would have been obvious to use laminations in the transformer per Hutchinson since laminations would have been desirable to direct magnetic flux through the transformer core.

10. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wiart, Elton and Hutchinson as applied to claim 14 above, further in view of Takaoka (US 5,094,703).

Wiart, Elton and Hutchinson substantially teach applicant's invention, but do not teach a cable with plural strands of insulated and uninsulated conductors.

Takaoka teaches a stranded large-sized, power transmission cable comprising a combination of uninsulated stranded conductors and insulated conductors (Figs.7-8, 10&11). The combination of insulated and uninsulated conductors reduces the total amount of insulation needed and reduces the coefficient of skin effect (c.2, lines 16-30).

It would have been obvious to modify Wiart, Elton and Hutchinson and provide insulated and uninsulated conductors per Takaoka since it would have reduced the coefficient of skin effect on the cable as well as the total amount of insulation needed for manufacture.

Conclusion

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Burton S. Mullins whose telephone number is 305-7063. The examiner can normally be reached on 9-5. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nestor Ramirez can be reached on 308-1371. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 305-1341 for regular communications and 305-1341 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 308-0956.



Burton S. Mullins
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2834

bsm
February 21, 2002